

# Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee

## Meeting 5 Notes

July 21, 2004

SeaTac

### Members & Alternates:

Bob Alberts	David Fujimoto	Kimberly Ordon	Debbie Thomas
Josh Baldi (for Judy Turpin)	Andrew Graham	Bob Pancoast	Frank Triplett
Randy Black	Richard Gustav	Rachael Paschal-Osborn	Dawn Vyvyan
Ben Bonkowski	John Kirner	Harry Paul	Donald Wright
Lynn Coleman	Connie Krueger	Jerry Peterson	
Gene Eckhardt	Jim Miller (for Marla Carter)	Steve Skipworth	
Tom Fox	Shirley Nixon	Denise Smith	

### DOH Staff & Consultants

Laird Harris	Denise Clifford	Jim Rioux
Cynara Lilly	Jennifer Kropack	Michele Vazquez
Barbara Smith	Deana Taylor	

**Others:** Danford Moore

### I. Introduction and Housekeeping

### II. Subcommittee and Process Changes

A. DOH told the subcommittee that they were making changes to the subcommittee process to try to achieve the best possible outcome. A specific model has not yet been picked. Some of the changes are listed below.

1. Laird Harris will not be serving in the same facilitation role.
2. Denis Clifford to lead today's meeting.
3. Rich Hoey will be taking over as lead.
4. Jim Rioux will continue to be involved behind the scenes.
5. The chairs will serve as liaisons to WSAC as well as being involved with the planning group process.
  - a. A planning group consisting of Harris and Smith Public Affairs, Karen Allston, Richard Gustav, David Johnson, and Bob Pancoast will be responsible for helping DOH develop a road map for subsequent meetings.

B. Barbara Smith and Denise Clifford will work on outreach. Input will come directly to WUES.

C. Jim Rioux walked through the agenda and explained packet materials.

1. WRIA data discussed. DOH recognizes problems associated with data collection. This discussion was referred to the data collection work group.

### **III. Water Use Efficiency Program Model**

A. WUES was asked to consider two matrices, and evaluate whether this was a good framework for DOH to develop requirements.

1. Several members expressed concern over requirements facing smaller systems and whether funding opportunities were available to implement new requirements.
2. There was also concern expressed over the connections between the three elements addressed: performance reporting, leakage standards and planning requirements.
3. Jim Rioux clarified for the group that requirements would be system based, not management based.
4. Characteristics other than size will be considered.
5. A few people felt that the matrices were unhelpful. Most felt DOH was on the right track with the matrices.

- a. Denise Clifford clarified that DOH is not looking for agreement as much as they are looking for discussion and asked the WUES whether the matrices served as an appropriate framework. Denise asked to hear more from the water utilities:

Several people felt that the matrices were a good framework. Concern was expressed over the need for flexibility and guidance for utilities, especially smaller ones.

- b. Jim Rioux asked for permission to move on, using the matrices and comments as guidelines.
  - i. ACTION: WUES members will e-mail further comments to DOH.
  - ii. ACTION: DOH will clarify whether the exercise of Section 5.3 Inchoate water would be a situation that could change system level.

### **IV. Subcommittee Discussion: Distribution Leakage Standard**

A. Jennifer Kropack facilitated a discussion on the leakage standard using a third matrix that lays out requirements for each category of system depicting size and planning document characteristics.

1. There is a need for some data collection and therefore some metering.
  - a. Jim Rioux clarified that he didn't feel that DOH had the legal authority to impose service meter requirements on utilities.
2. Non-revenue water, unaccounted for water, and leakage were defined.
3. The law does not allow DOH to impose a stricter level than 10% as a leakage standard.
  - a. There are three reasons behind looser requirements for smaller systems:
    - i. Lack of tools by DOH to understand the level of impact to approximately 1800 water systems. DOH has no idea what leakage exists in this size of systems doing only SWSMP. The question was never addressed in the SWSMP.
    - ii. Lack of utility resources and small customer base rate impacts of replacing mains.
    - iii. Ability of DOH to control 10% standard for this number of small systems.
  - b. Environmentalists on the subcommittee stated that 10% was not considered good enough and that service meters need to be required.
    - i. It was suggested that other states be examined so we would not be attempting to reinvent the wheel.

B. Jim Miller (on behalf of Marla Carter) presented how Everett handles zone metering.

1. A question surfaced as to how wholesale water is regulated and whether or not it was considered a part of the wholesale system.
2. Distribution leakage and supply leakage were discussed. Denise Clifford felt there was a fundamental disconnect in the understanding of this issue.

**V. Public Comment** – There was no public comment at this time.

## **VI. Working Lunch**

A. Jim Rioux reviewed several housekeeping items:

1. ACTION: WUES members should email comments on the June 23 meeting minutes and any worksheets to DOH.
2. ACTION: Work Groups will begin meeting on August 18, 2004 and on August 26, 2004.

3. ACTION: Jim Rioux will be setting up opportunities for WUES members to volunteer to make presentations.

## **VII. Return to Distribution Leakage Standard Discussion**

- A. It was suggested that a well run utility should have no trouble facing a 10% leakage standard.
- B. Differences between leakage and unaccounted for water were discussed.
  1. Flushing, fire department uses, and other types of unaccounted for water were considered. Estimation of these losses was discussed.
- C. Distribution system definition led to some confusion about when regulations would apply.
  1. Jim Rioux clarified that DOH assessment has always begun at the first customer.
  2. Transmission and distribution were discussed. DOH will review the legislation and current regulations to clarify whether both elements of system infrastructure should be considered when determining distribution system leakage.
- D. Several WUES members felt that the responsibility for understanding and tracking all system water losses and non-revenue uses should be incumbent on the utilities.
- E. Jim Rioux asked the WUES whether there were any problems with the imposition of a 10% leakage standard for all utilities.
  1. Richard Gustav explained that a flat 10% could serve as a conservation disincentive and asked WUES and DOH to consider alternative methodology such as a volumetric approach.
- F. Several committee members brought up accountability, especially pertaining to wholesale situations. Source to finish leakage in a wholesale system was questioned.
  1. ACTION: DOH will research the mathematical formula for source-to-finish water leakage percentages within a wholesale system and whether the issue can be addressed in regulation.
- G. Several committee members felt that they hadn't been given enough information about the effectiveness of zone metering to be convinced that this was a viable alternative.

H. Denise Clifford clarified that during the leakage standards discussion it was understood that 10% was an acceptable standard for all utilities.

1. No one objected.
2. Several members said that despite not objecting, they supported Richard Gustav's opinion that alternative methodologies should be considered.
3. The scenario presented by Richard was reviewed. A volumetric option was discussed.
4. There was a general interest in alternative methodologies.

#### **VIII. Subcommittee Discussion: Alternative Methodology in Leakage**

- A. Interest by WUES was recognized by DOH.
- B. Subcommittee discussion provided a number of optional approaches that DOH should allow as alternative methodologies.
- C. DOH concurred with the subcommittee that alternative methodologies should be allowed on a system specific basis.

#### **IX. Demand Forecasting Presentation**

- A. Deana Taylor presented on demand forecasting. presentation attached

#### **X. Public Comment**

- A. Danford Moore asked WUES members to mix up their seating in order to work with others and come to a consensus.

#### **XI. Meeting Wrap-up/Next Meeting Topics**

- A. WUES planning group will meet in early August.
- B. Demand Forecasting will be addressed at the next subcommittee meeting.
- C. ACTION: WUES will familiarize themselves with the EPA and AWWA manuals.

#### **Next subcommittee meeting:**

September 15, 2004

8:45 to 4:30

Spokane Falls Community College  
3410 West Fort George Wright Drive  
Spokane, Washington 99224-5288